DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 648 RC 016 501

AUTHOR Anderson, Margaret A.; Kleinsasser, Audrey M.
TITLE Will It Play in Rural America? Staff Development Realities.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children (New Orleans, LA, November, 1987). For related document, see ED 278 521.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; *Gifted; *Program Attitudes; Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Rural Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Small Schools; Special Education; Student Educational Objectives; Student Experience; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Kansas; *Uncertainty

ABSTRACT

General educators' perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs towards gifted learners and education of the gifted at both elementary and secondary levels in small, rural schools were examined. Eighteen teachers from a rural K-12 Kansas district having 518 students completed questionnaires during summer 1985 and during the 1985-86 school year, and the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment administered in May, 1986. Staff development activities were guided largely by incoming data. Researchers also observed classes with identified gifted students. Results showed that elementary teachers were unsure about the gifted program's effectiveness, its effect on students' educational experiences, its extensiveness, the adequacy of its goals and objectives, the number of students served, and the benefits to the regular classroom of having gifted students present. Generally, they felt that gifted children required special programming and would not initiate their own learning activities. In contrast, 50% of the secondary teachers held the opposite view. Over 80% of the secondary teachers were uncertain about, or disagreed with the view that being in the gifted program had been an effective educational experience for the students. Roughly 12% thought that the goals and objectives were adequate and required no change. Five recommendations, tables, references, and an annotated bibliography and resource list conclude the paper. (JMM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

DEC 1987
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

ED289648

Will it Play in Rural America?
Staff Development Realities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Margaret A. Anderson, Ph.D.
Rio Grande School
715 Camino Cabra
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Audrey M. Kleinsasser
2 Bailey Hall
Department of Educational Psychology and Research
the University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66045

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Audrey Kleinsasser
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Gifted Children, New Orleans, Louisiana, November, 1987.

RC016501

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Will it Play in Rural America?

Staff Development Realities and Gifted Education

Introduction

Picture the scene: Roughly 20 parents of various ages try to get comfortable in four or five rows of desks designed for 13-year-olds. It's a week night. The rural, consolidated junior-senior high school is quiet and dark except for this classroom where a professor specializing in gifted education has been invited by the superintendent to speak. The expert, from the state's largest university, will field questions from the audience, parents of gifted students.

Before the meeting adjourns, numerous topics will be aired, not settled. How will the district fulfill a mandate from the state education agency which directs all public schools to screen, test, and provide services for gifted students or be found in noncompliance of special education statute? What kind of programming is appropriate for the handful (ten students--three seventh graders, one eighth grader, three ninth graders, and three tenth graders) of identified junior and senior high gifted students who don't want to be treated differently, say their parents, yet seem to be entitled to a different education by virtue of their identification?

As the evening progresses, the questions come faster, charged with emotion and frustration. What is the district (re: the school board and superintendent) going to do after months of what seems like stalling on the gifted education issue? Are general educators going to adapt their methods and teaching styles to accommodate gifted students? What solution will the university expert devise that gets everyone out from behind the gifted education eight ball?

The scenario depicted above is not fiction. It occurred in a small, rural, midwestern school struggling with the same issues small schools everywhere in America face: maintain the stability of that which is desirable and positive about small town/small school-life while facing the reality of individual differences, parental pressure, and school change.

This paper presents the analysis of an attitude survey completed by elementary and secondary teachers at the close of a 1985-1986 research study funded by the University of Kansas. Additionally, qualitative research data are presented, supporting conclusions of the larger study. Findings pertinent to staff development strategy in small, geographically isolated, or rural schools will be reported and recommendations suggested. (NOTE: A preliminary analysis of selected aspects of this investigation can be found in a paper presented earlier. See Anderson & Kleinsasser, 1986.)

Review of Literature

There is little in the literature to suggest that the education of rural, gifted students is a pervasive interest of educational researchers. Yet, almost one-third of the states mandate gifted education by statute. All of them have rural populations, as does every state. To complete the gifted, rural education picture, the perspectives of educators, students, parents, administrators, school board members, community members, and special education personnel must be surveyed. Quantitative and qualitative investigations set in rural settings are warranted.

Moreover, there is a small concentration of research indicating that services to a population of rural gifted students present unique concerns for parents and educational planners. In one investigation, the role of the general educator in rural settings--as opposed to an urban counterpart--is emphasized (O'Connell & Hagans, 1985a) while another suggests that regular classroom teachers support services for gifted children (Witters, 1979).

Pringle (1972) describes an elementary enrichment project and reports that evaluation data indicate both student and teacher support, particularly for a resource center, not regular classroom activities. An investigation by Hamrin (1981) concludes that successful gifted education programs in rural areas are tied to teachers and administrators. Problems cited by

respondents to the Hamrin questionnaire include the following: 1) a lack of instructional preparation; 2) a lack of definition for gifted/talented consultant and classroom teacher roles; 3) a lack of data on effectiveness of alternative program models; and 4) a need for information about program implementation in small rural areas as well as funding.

In 1986, Anderson and Kleinsasser reported that rural elementary and secondary teachers in a small Kansas district generally support gifted education in the regular classroom. Teachers wanted more information and help in that implementation. Despite this position, most of them acknowledged a lack of expertise about the chief curriculum models used in the instruction of gifted students. Most were familiar with Bloom's Cognitive Taxonomy, with no significant differences between the responses of elementary and secondary instructors. While teachers were interested in knowing more about the academic and curricular needs of gifted students, they were less interested in social-emotional needs of gifted students or the needs of sub-groups of gifted students such as females or gifted learners with handicaps. That rural educators place low priority on social-emotional needs or academic pressures faced by gifted girls in rural settings is explored further by Kleinsasser (1986). She argues that general educators as well as teachers of the gifted can be unwitting agents of those pressures.

O'Connell & Hagans (1985b) present four characteristics of successful rural staff development. First, topics important to

rural educators should be highlighted. Second, inservice should be responsive to the stages of adult development. That includes a movement from strict, rigid beliefs to a breaking away from strict rules and beliefs, a recognition of a variety of available options, and finally, a synthesis of information that creates additional categories leading toward effective, spontaneous decision making. Third, follow-through and supervision by instructional leaders would enable teachers to turn theory into practice. Fourth, long-term staff development activities need to be planned which would address the stages of concern about change that teachers feel as they attempt to implement instructional alternatives for gifted students.

Problem Statement

What perceptions, attitudes and beliefs toward gifted learners and education of the gifted are held by general educators at both the elementary and secondary levels in small, rural schools?

Independent and Dependent Measures

Sex and teaching level of the respondents are the independent variables. Responses to an exit survey, the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment constitute the dependent variable.

Population

The study is generalizable to rural educators in Kansas.

Procedures

Teacher opinion was surveyed through paper/pencil questionnaires. This occurred during staff development sessions conducted by the chief investigator and research assistant, beginning at the end of the 1985 school year and continuing throughout the 1985-1986 school year. Staff development activities were guided largely by incoming data. For example, when virtually all of the teachers reported an interest in teaching/learning styles, a subsequent, large-group inservice focused on that concern. (See Anderson & Kleinsasser, 1986, for an analysis of the findings to four survey instruments. They include an initial Gifted Education Attitude Survey and an Inservice Interest Survey, a Myths of Gifted Education instrument, and a Knowledge of Teaching Models scale.)

Method

Subjects

The research design is one of intact groups, including elementary teachers, n=10 and secondary teachers, n=8, in a rural Kansas district having 518 students, grades K-12. Subjects teach in three K-6 elementary schools, all located in different towns and one 7-12 junior-senior high school. Many teachers, both male and female, are natives of the county. Some work at second jobs, e.g, farming, nursing home.

Instrumentation

The Gifted Education Attitude Assessment was administered in May, 1986, as part of the study's exit activities. It is composed of 21 statements to which teachers responded on a five point Likert scale from strongly disagree, disagree, uncertain, agree, to strongly agree.

A second component of the study was of a qualitative research nature. Elementary, junior, and senior high classes with identified gifted students were observed by the researchers and their teachers interviewed. Observations yielded a general assessment of classroom climate, teacher questioning strategies, and observable interactions of gifted students with the teacher, other students, and the lesson or content. At the junior and senior high level, participating teachers read the observation summaries and reacted to them, providing what Lincoln and Guba (1985) call a member check. In this way, preliminary analyses about the secondary school's gifted program and teachers' attitudes toward it were triangulated.

Data Analysis

Frequencies and percentages of responses are tabulated for all items to the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment survey. To test the hypothesis of independence, chi-square procedures $p < .05$, are reported.

Results

See Table 1 for percentages of responses to the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment survey.

Insert Table 1 about here

Uncertainly seems to characterize an overwhelming number of responses by elementary teachers. Teachers in grades one through six reported that they are unsure about the program's effectiveness, its effect on students' educational experiences, increased work expectations and inconveniences, the extensiveness of the program, the adequacy of program goals and objectives, the number of students served, and benefits to the regular classroom by having gifted students present. Interestingly, the elementary teachers surveyed were uncertain or disagree with the statement that gifted children do not require special programming and that they will initiate their own learning activities. This suggests that elementary teachers recognize the need for special services to gifted students.

In contrast, 50% of the secondary teachers (50%) responded that gifted students do <u>not</u> require special programming and will pursue interests on their own. Over 80% of the junior and senior high teachers were uncertain or disagree with the statement that being in the gifted program has been an effective educational experience for students. Roughly 12% of the secondary

teachers thought that the goals and objectives of the gifted program are adequate and require no change.

To test the null hypothesis that elementary and secondary teachers share similar proportions of the variable, the 21 variables comprising the instrument were subjected to chi-square analyses. Four statements were statistically significant at the .05 level.

Insert Table 2 about here

Significant chi-square results were found for these statements:

-- For students, being in the gifted program has been an effective educational experience.
-- At the present time, the gifted program services enough of the gifted population in the district.
-- Students in the gifted program have been included in appropriate projects that have extended their educational experiences.
-- At the present time, what a student accomplishes in the gifted program is minimal.

Discussion

In states with a rural population, but particularly those mandating gifted education, an assessment of the attitudes and concerns held by elementary and secondary teachers is critical to

program planning, implementation, and evaluation. Meaningful staff development programs must be designed with the input and support of educators who spend the most significant amount of time with gifted students--general education teachers.

Results of this study underscore the mixed feelings many elementary and secondary teachers have about gifted programming. On the one hand, educators generally support the notion of special services for gifted services, ideally within the regular or general classroom. On the other hand, they are not at all in agreement that those activities are effective educational experiences. Nor are they in agreement that enough students in the district are involved in gifted programming.

There are significant differences in the responses of elementary and secondary teachers to four of the statements from the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment. These differences might be accounted for by the closer relationship between the elementary teachers and the teacher of gifted education. The gifted specialist spent less time at the junior-senior high school and conferred less frequently with teachers there. Although the teacher was hired to assist all teachers, grades K-12, the teacher's background was in elementary education. Interview data substantiate the statement that the teacher's initial goal was to work with students and teachers in the three elementary schools since that seemed to be a reasonable and productive beginning. Future research must acknowledge curricular and instructional differences at the elementary and

secondary levels from a teacher's point of view, as well as a student's point of view.

There are limitations to the generalizability of this study. First, there is no validity or reliablity information available for the instrument. Second, the number of respondents is very small, particularly to the assessment instrument analyzed here. Therein lies an important issue with regard to empirical, quasi-experimental research designs in rural schools. Investigators must weigh the appropriateness of research designs dependent on large numbers when the nature of the research setting is one of uniqueness--a characteristic that isn't likely to change in rural communities prizing individual identities.

The qualitative research component of this study emphasized classroom observations and interviews with teachers and administrators. Staff development concerns and teacher needs with respect to gifted students highlighted the interviews. Obviously, a more complete picture of gifted education in a rural setting demands interviews with students of all academic and intellectual categories, parents, school board members, and support staff from the special education cooperative.

Despite the limitations listed above, qualitative data parallel and support quantitative findings from survey instruments. Unstructured interviews substantiated the empirical conclusion that teachers didn't have a clear perception of their responsibilities to their gifted students. Hamrin (1981), in an earlier investigation, comes to a similar conclusion. Confusion

about the gifted program was verbalized again and again at the secondary level: What was the gifted teacher's job? Was it that of teacher of students or consultant to teachers? Are the gifted teacher's roles different at the elementary and secondary levels? Specific to this study, what is the task for a teacher of the gifted to secondary teachers, a majority of whom believe gifted students need no special programming and will initiate learning activities on their own?

Recommendations

In an extensive, nation-wide evaluation study of rural special education Skrtic, Guba and Knowlton (1985) describe gifted education this way:

> The gifted program might well be labeled as the program that nobody wanted, or for that matter, wants. Mandated by state law, provisions (including funding) for the program are contained in the state's special education plan and carry all the weight of any program mounted for handicapped youngsters under P. L. 94-142. (Volume 2, page 29)

The program no one wants is also the program rural educators literally don't know what to do with. That explains an administrator's strategy in bringing a university consultant to the scene. It is important to realize that the role of the teacher of the gifted is analogous to that of the university consultant. Both are viewed as specialists, called in to clean up a problem. The problem is gifted education as mandated by

the state, usually with elaborate screening and identification measures that include more than a little paper work. Add to the problem the unique needs of a few students. Envision this in an environment that prizes general education for everyone, stability, and steadiness. The ideal treatment, of course, changes no one's life for the worse. Teaching loads are not increased. Individualization does not make students act or feel different from their peers. Special education budgets are not increased.

The first task of staff development focusing on gifted education in rural schools is to increase the confidence of general educators. Confidence will be increased by giving teachers the necessary tools to teach academically and intellectually gifted children. Large group staff development will continue to play a role in generally promoting educational programs for gifted students. More importantly, time, effort, and money should be designated for individual teacher growth, particularly when the introductory phase of program implementation is passed. This seems to be most important at the secondary level. Administrative support is crucial to the success of all phases of staff development.

Second, survey data suggesting that teachers are not interested in the social-emotional development of gifted students, the special needs of gifted females, or the handicapped gifted are disturbing. The independent and multi-faceted character of rural women must be acknowledged by education leaders in rural

areas. Attention to pertinent gender issues, the importance of adult-modeling, and the school counselor's role in academic and career advising are more crucial in rural schools than in urban areas where bright females are not forced to leave the environment to pursue academic or career goals. Teachers, administrators, and counselors must become aware of modeling behaviors that inhibit intellectual and social-emotional growth for females and males. Quality print and non-print materials are available from many organizations addressing gender equity issues, many appropriate for large and small group staff development sessions. See Appendix A for an annotated bibliography.

Third, add-on staff development options such as university consultation on a bi-monthly basis or itinerant teachers of the gifted whom general educators view as unwelcome or insignificant visitors in the building are not likely to affect permanent change or improvement for gifted education in rural environments. Outside resource persons are vital. They can stimulate thought, chair problem-solving discussions, and participate in long-term planning. They are seldom, however, miracle workers for an administrator in trouble with his or her constituency.

Fourth, the task of educating bright, rural students belongs to general educators, administrators, and the community. Teachers in rural communities fail to take advantage of rich community resources. Most rural communities have a proportionately large population of retired citizens, many of whom have special interests, talents, and most importantly, time and an

investment in the community. Proponents of gifted education in rural states could tap this resource, for little or no cost. With the assistance of the state department of education, the state arts council, and various senior citizens' groups, both state-wide and local networks could be established.

Finally, for gifted education to work in rural areas, its proponents must learn to prize that which is positive about rural people, their schools, and communities. It means acknowledging what works and what doesn't work. Most important, it means being persistent and planning for a long run. In a sentence, that describes how it plays in rural America.

References

Anderson, M. A., & Kleinsasser, A. M. (1986). Beliefs and attitudes of rural educators and their perceived skill levels in using curriculum models for the education of gifted learners. Paper presented at Annual Conference of the National Small and Rural Schools Consortium. Bellingham, WA.

Hamrin, J. M. (1981). Problems in implementing gifted/ talented programs in 11 rural Maine schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 538)

Kleinsasser, A. M. (1986). Exploration of an ambiguous culture: Conflicts facing gifted females in rural environments. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Rural and Small Schools Consortium, Bellingham, WA.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). "Establishing trustworthiness", in Lincoln & Guba's Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, Sage Publications. 314-316.

O'Connell, C. & Hagans, R. (1985). High achievement in rural schools. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon. National Institute of Education, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 008)

O'Connell, C. & Hagans, R. (1985). Staff development in rural schools Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon. National Institute of Education, Washington, D. C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 009)

Pringle, R. G. et al. (1972). Innovative education for gifted children in rural elementary schools. Elementary School Journal. 73(2), 79-84.

Skrtic, T. M., Guba, E. G., & Knowlton, H. E. (1985). Interorganizational special education programming in rural areas: Technical report on the multisite naturalistic field study. Washington, D. C. National Institute of Education.

Witters, L. A. (1979). (1979). The needs of rural teachers in gifted education. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 3(2), 79-82.

Table 1

Percentages* of Elementary Teachers' Responses to the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment

	Elementary n=10				
ITEM (response code a)	5	4	3	2	1
1. Gifted education is an important part of the total educational process.	10%	40%	10%	40%	--
2. At the present time, you feel the gifted program in your building is an effective one.	10%	10%	60%	10%	10%
3. The gifted education teacher is an effective resource in your classroom's educational program.	10%	10%	30%	40%	10%
4. At the present time, you view the gifted education teacher as a valuable asset to your school.	--	30%	30%	30%	10%
5. For students, being in the gifted program has been an effective educational experience.	--	10%	80%	10%	--
6. Gifted education teachers have responsibilities equal to regular classroom teachers.	--	20%	30%	30%	20%
7. Gifted education programs encourage attitudes of elitism among gifted students.	--	70%	20%	10%	--
8. The gifted program should be extended to more students.	--	60%	30%	10%	--
9. Having students in the gifted program has created additional work for me.	--	11%	67%	11%	11%
10. The gifted education teacher has provided valuable resources and information for classroom teachers.	--	20%	20%	20%	40%
11. Having gifted and talented children in class can be an inconvenience.	--	30%	70%	--	--
12. At the present time, the gifted program services enough of the gifted population in the district.	--	--	100%	--	--

a 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

*percentages rounded to nearest tenth

Table 1, continued

ITEM (response code a)	Elementary n=10 5	4	3	2	1
13. Gifted education is something else to add to an already crowded schedule.	--	40%	40%	20%	--
14. At the present time, the goals and objectives of the gifted program are adequate and need no change.	--	20%	80%	--	--
15. Students in the gifted program have been included in appropriate projects that have extended their educational experiences.	--	11%	89%	--	--
16. At the present time, what a student accomplishes in the gifted program is minimal.	--	--	100%	--	--
17. Gifted children do not require special programming and will pursue activities through their own initiative.	--	--	56%	33%	11%
18. The regular classroom benefits by having gifted children in there.	--	33%	67%	--	--
19. Primary students should be included in a gifted program.	11%	56%	33%	--	--
20. Instructing gifted children can be a source of frustration	22%	22%	44%	11%	--
21. Gifted children rarely perform up to expectations or potential.	11%	--	44%	44%	--

a 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

Table 1, continued

Percentages* of Secondary Teachers' Responses to the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment

	Secondary n=8				
ITEM (response code a)	5	4	3	2	1
1. Gifted education is an important part of the total educational process.	25%	50%	13%	13%	--
2. At the present time, you feel the gifted program in your building is an effective one.	--	38%	25%	25%	13%
3. The gifted education teacher is an effective resource in your classroom's educational program.	--	38%	--	37%	25%
4. At the present time, you view the gifted education teacher as a valuable asset to your school.	13%	38%	13%	37%	--
5. For students, being in the gifted program has been an effective educational experience.	--	13%	50%	37%	--
6. Gifted education teachers have responsibilities equal to regular classroom teachers.	12%	25%	50%	--	12%
7. Gifted education programs encourage attitudes of elitism among gifted students.	12%	37%	25%	25%	--
8. The gifted program should be extended to more students.	--	25%	25%	37%	12%
9. Having students in the gifted program has created additional work for me.	--	12%	25%	37%	25%
10. The gifted education teacher has provided valuable resources and information for classroom teachers.	--	12%	25%	50%	12%
11. Having gifted and talented children in class can be an inconvenience.	--	12%	37%	25%	25%
12. At the present time, the gifted program services enough of the gifted population in the district.	--	50%	50%	--	--

a 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

*percentages rounded to nearest tenth

Table 1, continued

ITEM (response code a)	Secondary n=8 5	4	3	2	1
13. Gifted education is something else to add to an already crowded schedule.	12%	12%	--	62%	12%
14. At the present time, the goals and objectives of the gifted program are adequate and need no change.	--	12%	37%	37%	12%
15. Students in the gifted program have been included in appropriate projects that have extended their educational experiences.	--	25%	62%	12%	--
16. At the present time, what a student accomplishes in the gifted program is minimal.	--	37%	37%	25%	--
17. Gifted children do not require special programming and will pursue activities through their own initiative.	12%	12%	--	50%	25%
18. The regular classroom benefits by having gifted children in there.	37%	50%	12%	--	--
19. Primary students should be included in a gifted program.	25%	25%	25%	25%	--
20. Instructing gifted children can be a source of frustration	--	62%	25%	12%	--
21. Gifted children rarely perform up to expectations or potential.	--	25%	50%	50%	--

a 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = uncertain
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

Table 2

Results of Chi-square Analyses of the Gifted Education Attitude Assessment

Item #	chi-square	df	significance
1.	3.76	6	.71
2.	9.4	8	.31
3.	10.68	8	.22
4.	7.34	8	.5
5.	11.25	4	.024 *
6.	9.53	8	.3
7.	5.65	6	.46
8.	9.1	6	.17
9.	6.81	6	.34
10.	9.5	6	.15
11.	9.82	6	.13
12.	9.74	2	.008 *
13.	12.18	8	.14
14.	9.43	6	.15
15.	13.11	6	.04 *
16.	16.03	4	.003 *
17.	9.9	8	.27
18.	8.2	4	.08
19.	5.7	6	.46
20.	6.43	6	.38
21.	13.6	8	.09

$p < .05$

Appendix A

Annotated Bibliography and Resource List: Toward Sexual Equity in Educational Settings

American Women in Science Biographies

the Equity Institute
P.O. Box 30245
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Suitable for elementary math, science, language, arts, social studies, health/sport, career education, counseling, at home, and in equity efforts. Overcoming barriers of race, sex, poverty, and language to achieve their goals are these women scientists and thinkers: Constance Tom Noguchi, Antoinette Rodez Schiesler, Dixy Lee Ray, Sally Ride, Nancy Wallace, Shirley Mathis McBay, Maria Cordero Hardy, Agnes Naranjo Stroud-Lee, Ru Chih Cheo Huang, and Elma Gonzalez. Video cassette (to learn about the scientific method and the importance of question asking) and teaching guide are available.

Bibliography of Available Sex Equity Resources

Illinois State Board of Education
Springfield, Illinois

This ERIC document (ED 240 021) reports a Title IV desegregation project. Included are 12 women's biographies as well as information relative to counseling, guidance, and career education, inservice training/staff development, parent and community groups, sex-role stereotyping and sex bias, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, women biographies, women in educational administration, women's studies.

Career Alternatives

Townsend-Kraft Publishing Company
104 N. Main Street
Liberty, Missouri 64068

This free magazine is for students faced with career decisions. It includes a variety of career options, opportunities, and educational alternatives.

Clearinghouse for Rural Education and Small Schools (CRESS)

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, NM 88003-0042

A Curriculum Guide to Women's Studies for the Middle School Grades, 5-9

the Feminist Press
Box 334
Old Westbury, NY 11568

This is a curriculum guide for teaching about women in history and society containing 20 lesson plans, a practical introduction, and a list of related resources. Unit titles are "All about Stereotyping", "Women in the Past", "Women in Today's World", and "Taking Charge of Our Lives".

The Directory of Special Opportunities for Women

Garret Park Press
Garret Park, Maryland 20896

This national guide to educational opportunities, career information, networks, and peer counseling is edited by Martha Merrill Doss costing $18. Included are 1000 listings of national, state, county, city, and private organizations, associations, programs, and agencies where women can find educational and career opportunities.

the Eclectic Company

287 E. 6th St. Suite 610
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 227-7401

Catalog of Quality Recordings for Children Educators and Adults, Fall, 1985, which includes the WOMEN OF COURAGE series: Rosa Parks, Sybil Ludington, Sally Ride, Harriet Tubman, Gertrude Ederle, Mutsimiuna (Buffalo Calf Road Woman), Susan B. Anthony, Nelly Bly, Wilma Rudolph, Eleanor Roosevelt, Lois Steele, MD., Ida Lewis, Kaahumanu. Teaching materials are also available.

the Equity Institute

4715 Cordell Ave. or P. O. Box 30245
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
(301) 654-2904

Every Woman's Guide to Colleges and Universities

the Feminist Press
11 East 94th Street
New York, NY 10128

Edited by Florence Howe, Suzanne Hoard, and Mary Jo Boehm Strauss, this $14.95 guide grew out of a two year project funded in part by the Fund for the Improvement of a Post Secondary Education. It is a valuable reference source for young women, parents, transferring students, older women contemplating return to classrooms, as well as for guidance counselors, school administrators, public and school librarians, and college admission officers. Provided are state by state guides on 600 schools in up to ten categories. Schools are rated by curriculum, athletics and accessibility to positions of leadership.

Exploring Careers

US Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Bulletin 2001
Superintendent of Documents
Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

Written for junior high schools ($11), this illustrated, 550 page book promotes career awareness through occupational narratives, evaluation questions, suggested activities, and career games. It is organized into career clusters and packaged to facilitate group or individual use. It is suitable for older students as well.

the Feminist Press

at the City University of New York
311 East 94th Street
New York, NY 10128
(212) 360-5790

Contents of the catalog include listings for new books, new editions, recently published, unique interdisciplinary texts, definitive literary anthologies, classics/novels, classics/short fiction, biography, autobiography, history, sociology, oral history, resources for teachers, researchers, librarians, children's literature, journals, author index, and title index. Representative titles include: Books for Today's Children: an annotated Bibliography of non-stereotyped Picture Books; Nonsexist Curricular Materials for Elementary Schools, Strong Women: an annotated Bibliography of Literature for the High School Classroom, Woman's "True" Profession: Voices from the History of Teaching.

Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language

NCTE
1111 Kenyon Road
Urbana, Illinois 61801
(National Council Teachers of English Publications) Revised, 1984. Single copies are free with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Lists suggestions for pronoun choice, sex-role stereotyping, revised passages, representation of men and women, implementation of guidelines, and references.

Higher Education Opportunities for Minorities--and Women
Annotated Selections, 1985-1986 Edition

US Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202
This government document provides information for undergraduate opportunities, graduate opportunities, post doctoral studies, and scholarship/grant availabilities. Sources and addresses of general information the provided.

National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs

1832 M. Street NW
Suite 821
Washington, DC 20036

NIE Information Quarterly Newsletter

Publications
Mail Stop 22
NIE
Washington, DC 20202-1100
This is a listing of annual reports of the National Council on Educational Research. Include a self-addressed label.

Resources for Educational Equity

Women's Educational Equity Act Publishing Center
Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel Street
Newton, Massachusetts 02160
(617) 969-7100
toll free: 800-225-3088

Includes curriculum materials for grades K-12, career guidance, early childhood/elementary, language arts/social studies, math/science, physical education, post-secondary, women's studies; career development in the areas of career education, continuing education, vocational education; staff development for administration, community relations/social services, teacher education; and specialized materials for bilingual/multicultural, gifted and talented, minority, and rural populations.

Sex Equity in Education

US Government Printing Office
North Capitol Bet.
G & H Streets NW
Washington, DC 20402
(202) 783-3238

Includes a listing of NIE Sponsored Projects and Publications available for purchase.

Statistical Information Office

National Center for Educational Statistics
1001 Presidential Building
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20202
(301) 436-7900